

THE CHAPLAIN IN THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND

LECTURE I.

THE CHAPLAIN AND THE PARISH MINISTER.

Origin of word "Chaplain"—St Martin of Tours—Specialisation in the Ministry—Presbyterian doctrine of orders—Origin of the parish system—Ministry in the Celtic Church—Religious communities—Parochialism at the Reformation—Secession and Disruption—Union of 1929—The parish to-day—The relation between Chaplains and parochial clergy—Scheme of the lectures.

I.

THE word "Chaplain" has an interesting and indeed romantic history.

The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary defines it thus :—

"CHAPLAIN. Old English (adoption of Old French *chapelain*—late Latin *capellanus*, from *capella*, CHAPEL, *q.v.*). 1. *generally*, The priest, clergyman, or minister of a Chapel; in Middle English a chantry priest. 2. *specifically*, A clergyman who conducts religious services in the private chapel of a sovereign, lord, or high official, of a public institution, or in the household of a person of quality, in a legislative chamber, regiment, ship, &c."

Turning to CHAPEL in the same monumental work, we find this explanation: "From the *capella* or cloak of St Martin, the name was applied to the sanctuary in which this was kept under the care of its *capellani* or chaplains."

St Martin of Tours was born in Pannonia (roughly corresponding to modern Hungary) in A.D. 336. Though both his parents were heathen, he became a catechumen at the age of ten, and desired to embrace the life of a hermit. But his father, a military tribune, insisted on Martin following in his footsteps, in accordance with an imperial decree that sons of veterans must serve in the army. At the age of fifteen the lad was carried in chains to the recruiting office and compelled to take the oath of enlistment—an early conscientious objector.

Despite this rather inauspicious start to his new career, Martin quickly rose from the ranks to become a cavalry officer, gaining in patrol service the confidence of his superiors.

"It was in his eighteenth year," writes Dean Farrar (1), "that the incident occurred with which Christian art has identified his name. . . . He was in winter quarters at Amiens, and the winter was one of intense severity, during which Martin had freely given of his goods to feed the poor. One day in January 354 he was passing through the gate of the city when he saw a poor man half-naked in the bitter cold. Martin was unable to give him alms, for he had already parted with all his money. But he was warmly clad. On his head was the gilded iron helmet with its red plume, and over his short tunic the ample sagum or military cloak (*chlamys*) was fastened by a brooch and flowed over his

shoulders. He did not hesitate. Drawing his short sword, he cut the mantle in two halves, gave half to the shivering sufferer, and was content to wrap the disfigured fragment round his own person. . . . If he felt a little ashamed at his appearance, there was a glow of joy in his heart as he thought of the words, 'I was naked, and ye clothed Me.' His waking thoughts reproduced themselves in nightly dreams. As he slept, he thought that he saw the Lord Christ clad in his half-mantle . . . who cried aloud, 'Martin, though he is only a catechumen, has clothed Me with this garment.' "

Tradition affirms that this same half-cape, the *cappa brevior Sancti Martini*, was preserved as a sacred relic by the Frankish kings. They took it with them into the field. The tent which sheltered it, raised above the altar where divine worship was celebrated, became the chapel, "the place of the cape," and its ministrants were called Chaplains, "cape-men," as distinguished from the parochial clergy.

St Martin may therefore be rightly regarded as the patron saint of all Chaplains, and perhaps especially those of Scotland (2), where his name is still commemorated in one of our Scottish quarter-days—Martinmas. We honour him as the father in God of St Ninian (3) and one of the greatest figures in the Celtic Church: fittingly does his cross stand to this day outside the door of Iona Cathedral.

St Hilary of Poitiers had been the chief though not the only Celtic bishop to revolt against the formalism and secularism of the imperialised episcopate. St Martin was his favourite disciple, and in turn the teacher of St Ninian, Scotland's proto-

evangelist. Strangely enough, St Martin does not figure in MacKinlay's *Ancient Scottish Church Dedications* (though we have Kilmartin at Lochgilphead and St Martin's at Scone), nor in the modern *Church of Scotland Year-Book*—unless the Martin's Memorial Church, Stornoway, is named for the Saint rather than for some pious benefactor of much later date.

Roman mediæval influence may have been responsible for the depreciation and neglect of one who had so stoutly withstood the imperialised city bishops of his day. Thus Scott (4) suggests that St Maurs, Maurus or Maurice (Kilmaurs) may have been substituted for an original St Martin. Whether this be the case or not, the oblivion to which he has been relegated, in a land and Church which owe him so much, is surprising and scarcely creditable.

II.

So much for the origin of the word "Chaplain." To-day it is used, in a wider sense than ever before, for what we may call a *specialised* ministry.

Ours is an age of growing specialisation. The cynic may define the specialist as "one who knows more and more about less and less." But this development is inevitable. Life grows ever more intricate with the progress of knowledge and the achievements of civilisation. Da Vincis are no longer a practicable possibility. Francis Bacon might boast, in his letter to Lord Burleigh, "I have taken all knowledge to be my province": but he has been dead for three centuries, and few if any to-day would venture to repeat the claim.

Such specialists do not appear in the earliest days of the Church. As to the nature and functions of its ministry there has been much argument. We need not discuss here the later differentiation between the presbyter and the bishop—originally one and the same office (5). We are on less debatable ground in claiming that, whether they are called elders, pastors, teachers, presbyters or bishops, the duties of all these functionaries, in the small and scattered communities of the Way, cannot have been highly differentiated.

True, various "orders" are classified in 1 Corinthians xii. 28: "And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues"; also in Ephesians iv. 11: "And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers." But these charismatic ministries, thrown up, as it were, by the new life of the Spirit, do not seem to have created any permanent organisation. Under the leadership and guidance of the apostles they helped to shape the infant Church, but there is no suggestion about them of a settled, official ministry. That does not come before the appointment of the first deacons at Jerusalem (Acts vi. 1-6); while the presbyterate or eldership is not definitely referred to until Acts xi. 30.

As Christianity gradually emerged, from a small, struggling Jewish sect to assume the stature of a world religion, the distinction between clergy and laity sharpened, and the former were classified in different grades: the "sacred and major" orders of Sub-deacon, Deacon, and Presbyter, *primi clerici*;

and those *inferioris loci*, including Doorkeepers (*Ostiarii*), Readers (*Lectores*), Exorcists (*Exorcistæ*), and Acolytes (*Acolythis*). The Roman Pontifical has offices for the ordination of all these officials, as well as for the consecration of Bishops, the benediction of Abbots and Abbesses, the benediction and consecration of Virgins (nuns). These latter formed a third class of religious—the regular (under a rule); as distinguished from the secular or parochial clergy.

The mediæval Church grew very highly organised. Its machinery, indeed, became so complicated as to be unwieldy and top-heavy. The abuses inherent in such ultra-specialised, elaborate systems of officialdom were one chief cause of the Reformation (6).

In Scotland our reforming forefathers proved more radical than their brethren south of the Border. The Scottish nature, despite its deep underlying tenderness, tends to be severely logical, intolerant, unequivocal, and forthright; it has none of the English genius for compromise. When John Knox and his colleagues, under Calvin's influence, reformed the Church of Scotland in 1560 and the following years, they struck at the root of the whole papal system instead of merely trimming its more redundant and unsightly branches.

Disregarding ecclesiastical tradition, however ancient, these men turned to Holy Writ in order to discover the true, original pattern of Holy Kirk. The Papacy, as possessing no divine sanction, was wholly disowned. So too (though perhaps not quite so unanimously) was the Episcopate—since, as we have said, bishop and presbyter were originally names for one and the same order. The elaborate Roman pyramid of successive official grades was

replaced by a new kind of pyramid, "broad-based upon a people's will." "It is lawful, and agreeable to the word of God," says *The Form of Church-Government*, "that the Church be governed by several sorts of assemblies, which are congregational, classical, and synodical." It goes on to define these terms. The base of the pyramid is the "congregational assembly" (now the Kirk Session, a phrase curiously not found in this document). The "classical assembly" (*classis* in many European Reformed Churches) is the Presbytery. The "synodical assemblies" are divided into provincial (Synod), national (General Assembly), and œcumenical.

Henceforth, in Scotland, the Church court and not the Church official ruled. In its hierarchy of courts ecclesiastical, lay elders sat in equal numbers with the clergy. Among the latter reigned a perfect "parity of presbyters." It is true that each Session, Presbytery, Synod, and General Assembly elects its Moderator to rule for a limited term (in the case of the Session, the term of the minister's office). But there is no such thing as a Moderator of the Church of Scotland, in the same sense as an Archbishop of the Church of England. His proper title is "Moderator of the General Assembly": and, after his year of office, he quietly returns to his parish—which indeed, in theory, he has never left.

In its earlier days the reformed Church of Scotland experimented with "superintendents," who may appear to some a continuation of bishops. But their use proved only a temporary expedient, even if one that many would willingly revive to-day. They were not *episcopi*: even laymen might be appointed to the office. Henceforth, apart from the

Episcopal interregna, the normal pattern of the Scottish ministry was as it has remained down to the present day. By 1645 *The Form of Church-Government* is able to affirm with confidence: "The officers which Christ hath appointed for the edification of his Church, and the perfecting of the saints, are, some extraordinary, as apostles, evangelists, and prophets, which are ceased. Others ordinary and perpetual, as pastors, teachers, and other church-governors, and deacons."

Of the "other church-governors" (ruling elders) and "deacons" nothing need be said here. The teacher or doctor will be referred to in a later lecture. Apart from him, only one type of ministry seems to be envisaged—the parochial. To quote once more from the *Form*, "Where there is but one minister, in a particular congregation, he is to perform, as far as he is able, the whole work of the ministry"—work earlier defined in the same document as praying with and for the sick, reading the Scriptures publicly, preaching the Word, catechising, dispensing the divine mysteries, administering the Sacraments, blessing the people from God, taking care of the poor, and having also a ruling power over the flock as a pastor.

III.

There was, however, one Roman mediæval feature which the Scottish reformers readily adopted—the *parish* as the unit of Church organisation.

The original ecclesiastical system of Scotland, as Dr John Cunningham points out in his *Church*

History (7), was abbatial, not episcopal, tribal rather than diocesan. The "Bishops of the Scots" had no circumscribed diocese. It was not until 1107 that King Alexander I. introduced the English diocesan system. A further subdivision of the land into parishes quickly followed. The lord of the manor erected a church for his vassals, tithing its soil for the priest's maintenance. These "teinds," as they were called in Scotland, remained in operation in *quoad omnia* parishes down to the union of the Churches in 1929.

Let us enlarge a little upon this (8). Although the elevation of bishops as chief presbyters of the Roman *civitates* took place at a fairly early date, they had no sees until Constantine's edicts gave Christians complete security and liberty to organise their religion. The Council of Nicæa was a congress of largely independent units. Where the word "parish" is found in the early records of Christendom, it implies no territorial boundaries, but simply views local Christians as one family group, distinct from the heathen world surrounding them, a "camp of the saints" (Rev. xx. 9), ever upon the march, the pilgrim-way. The ideal is summed up by John Wesley in his *Journal*: "I look upon all the world as my parish." It was Constantine who required that the Churches should adopt a unity of organisation parallel with that of the Empire itself, having a monarchical bishop in control of each city-state.

This question occupied much time and thought, until finally settled at the Council of Chalcedon (451). Even then the arrangement strictly applied only to the Roman Empire, with its provinces and *civitates*. As Gibbon points out, Honorius had by

this time released the British cities from their allegiance, so that the solution of Chalcedon was no longer applicable to the British Church. Indeed, the Eastern Church as a whole, and especially the Celtic Church, largely refused to accept the new organisation. This is true even of the ancient Roman province of Gaul, as we have already seen when speaking of St Martin.

In Ireland, for example, the Scoto-Dalriadic St Patrick makes no mention of the Pope or of Rome, resting his claim to convert the Irish upon his own divine call. He found among them no centralised government, only a welter of disintegrated tribes, with which he dealt one at a time, always starting with the chief. When he had won the latter over, it was his method to demand a gift of land adjoining the chief's hall, where he built a church and consecrated a presbyter-bishop to minister to the clan.

St Columba continued the same system in Iona and its daughter settlements. The "seniors" of the monasteries were the germ of the synods in whom authority was ultimately vested.

"It is quite clear," writes Bullard, "that up to and after Chalcedon there were two systems of development—both orthodox in faith, both synodal, both episcopal—but differing on the point of whether the jurisdiction was a matter of the map or a matter of spiritual affinity with some particular community. The former system embodied the cadre of the Roman Empire; the latter followed the ageless subconscious instinct of the followers of Abraham, expressed concretely in the synagogue system."

The unit of pastoral oversight, then, in the old

Celtic Church of Britain was the tribe or clan. We have seen how, after its absorption by Rome, this was in turn succeeded by the parish. Almost before the latter had time to develop and establish its usefulness, however, it was threatened in turn with destruction by a new and disturbing element. The secular or parochial clergy, under their bishops and synods, found themselves invaded by an ever-growing number of "regulars." Unlike the old Celtic monasteries, whose lingering close was marked by the mysterious Culdee settlements, these Augustinian or Benedictine communities owed allegiance to their own superiors, and so to the Pope. Bishops and synods were both short-circuited. Moreover, their revenues were secured at the expense of the parochial clergy. The situation inevitably created friction and rivalry, which exist in the Roman Church to this very day. This is not said to belittle the great and solid achievements of such Orders, which carried on much of the specialised work of the Church—indeed, of civilisation itself—in the Dark Ages. But the possibilities of disagreement, with two differently administered systems working side by side in the same area, are obvious. One has only to read Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales* or Sir David Lindsay's *Complaynt of the Papingo* and *Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis*, with their trenchant attacks on the lust, greed, and ignorance of the religious orders in later years, to see that popular sympathy lay rather with the parish priest than with his monastic rival.

The notorious corruption and overwhelming accumulation of wealth in Scotland's two hundred religious houses had not a little to do with the

Réformation, at which they were dissolved. Henceforth our Church put all its ecclesiastical eggs in one basket of national pattern—the parochial system. Consequently it is often difficult to-day, when launching experiments along the line of “Chaplain” ministries, to adapt regulations like those of the Maintenance of the Ministry Committee to cover a new type of ministerial service. In this connection it is significant to find, as No. 27 in the *Principles and Recommendations of the Church of Scotland's Joint Committee on Evangelism*, published last year, the following statement :—

“*Special Chaplaincies.* We recommend that careful consideration should be given to the development of the policy of instituting a variety of special chaplaincies. For this purpose the Church of Scotland should revise some of its existing regulations and methods, and replan the distribution and use of its financial and ministerial resources.”

No. 12 reads : “We recommend that the Church should give more careful consideration to the opportunities for indirect evangelism in our time. This may involve more frequent ordination of men appointed to special tasks, and more adequate financial provision for those commissioned to special spheres of service” (9).

It may be mentioned that of late years that very interesting experiment, the Iona Community (10), has given to the Church of Scotland a new type of Order, though not monastic in the older sense of the word. Its success may possibly lead in the future to the institution of similar communities. If so, this Church of ours will face a situation new to

it since Reformation days. If it does not now "redd the marches," in the interests alike of communities and of parishes, there might conceivably arise another division of loyalties and interests, with resulting misunderstanding, friction, and needless rivalry.

As early as the *Didache* we see the now settled Christian Churches legislating against itinerant, intrusive "teachers," and limiting their stay in one place to a couple of days, after which, policemanlike, they told the strangers to "move on." Already there has begun the long controversy between two different techniques for preaching the Gospel and extending the Kingdom.

As things stand now, the rights of the parish minister are officially unchallenged within his own allotted corner of the Vineyard—and every place in the land is, of course, in one such area. The non-intrusion Act of Assembly, 1843, x., was reaffirmed by the reunited Church in Act 1933, viii., which runs as follows:—

"A minister's field of ministerial work and responsibility lies within and does not extend beyond his own parish. A minister shall not be at liberty to overstep his own bounds and enter those of another to perform ministerial functions without the previous consent of the minister within the bounds of whose parish he proposes to enter, unless he be acting under special commission or order of the Presbytery of the bounds, or of a Superior Court having jurisdiction: provided always that a minister may enter the bounds of a parish other than his own for the purpose of ministering to

members and adherents of his own congregation, or to officiate at a marriage or funeral by private invitation."

According to Dr Cox, however, the Act does not prohibit a minister from accepting an invitation to conduct divine service in a church of another denomination (11).

That was and is an admirable rule, just as the parish was and is an admirable system. But we cannot ignore the fact that a method of organisation which proved all-sufficient in Scotland before the Industrial Revolution, with its small towns and the majority of its people still living in rural districts, may need considerable readjustment if it is to provide equally effective machinery for the very different needs of the present day.

IV.

For two centuries after the Reformation the parochial system reigned supreme and unchallenged. The minister was spiritually monarch of all he surveyed. His parish, moreover, was both *quoad civilia* and *quoad sacra*: it was, in short, *quoad omnia*. Its Kirk Session had the care of the poor and of the schools as well as the religious oversight of all the parishioners.

But now there occurred a series of historical events which shattered the unity and marred the efficiency of parochialism (to use the word in its original sense). These need only passing mention here. The two Secessions of 1733 and 1752 led to

the building of churches, especially in the larger towns, which ministered to their adherents not on any parish basis but rather as "causes," drawing them from widely scattered areas. The "Societies" of the hill-men, which dated from the old Covenanting days of Richard Cameron or John M'Millan of Balmaghie, were perhaps their true spiritual ancestors. The Disruption of 1843 was rather different. The Free Church of Scotland, then formed, at first believed strongly in the national recognition of religion, in contrast with the Secession churches, which had largely embraced the voluntary principle. Henceforth, in almost every parish, two rival buildings stood, often literally side by side. It may be claimed that this duplication helped to cope with the influx of population into the industrial centres in the early nineteenth century, by providing hundreds of "church extension charges" where they were most needed. Unfortunately the new churches were (as has just been said) usually erected near the old ones, instead of at other strategic centres, while in country districts and the smaller towns there was overchurching on a disastrous scale. Moreover, a wedge was driven between the Scottish people. Those who worked and played together through the week, grimly separated on Sundays to their separate conventicles. The witness of the *koinonia*, the Christian fellowship, was tragically impaired, and the Master's seamless garment rent in twain.

Again, the enthusiasm of the Free Church for the parochial system gradually waned, especially after its union in 1900 with the United Presbyterians (representing the Secessions) to form the United Free Church of Scotland. The "Auld Kirk," with

some honourable exceptions, now stood virtually alone in *systematic* visitation of the churchless, and the provision for them of the ordinances of religion.

It was all the freer to do so, since amid the growing complexities and responsibilities of civil administration it had abandoned the official superintendence of poor relief, under the Poor Law Act of 1845, to the State, as likewise its schools, handed over to the new School Boards in 1872. The Free Church followed suit with the much smaller number of schools it also possessed.

This situation of a disunited Church, and consequently a divided Christian witness, was the chief cause, under God, which led to the reunion in 1929 of the Church of Scotland and its separated daughters. The first World War had revealed how grievously Scotland needed spiritual shepherding. Only a united Church could save the day.

Nevertheless the word "parish" seemed destined, at the outset, to suffer complete eclipse. *The Basis and Plan of Union* speaks only of "a territorial ministry." The time-honoured title of "Parish Sister" was changed to the more colourless, less explicit "Church Sister." Ordinations and inductions were no longer to "this parish and congregation": the formula now ran: "Do you accept and close with the call to be Pastor of this charge?"—an indefinite phrase.

Of course there was a reason for this alteration. The word "parish" had, for some of our brethren from the United Free Church, come to have a party sound about it: it smacked too strongly of "the Establishment," and so their churches, after 1929, were, with but few exceptions, renamed, not "So-

and-so Parish Church," but "So-and-so Church of Scotland"—an ugly, misleading usage which almost sounded as if some new-fangled denomination had sprung into being! The misleading analogy of "So-and-so United Free Church" was of course responsible. But can we imagine our English brethren using a weird title like "Brown's Lane Church of England"? It is much to be hoped, that this strange new fashion may soon die out (12).

As a matter of fact, no qualifying suffix at all is required for the name of a national Church. My late elder, Lord Sands of honoured memory, once said to me that, when a man belonged to it, he did not need to go about explaining, defining, or defending his choice. His was the Church of Scotland, the Church of the nation, whose members could simply say: "*J'y suis ; j'y reste.*"

Again, it was natural that those long accustomed to think of the local church as congregational rather than parochial in form should find it somewhat difficult to realise their new responsibilities for all the men, women, and children residing within their allotted territory. Nor did the latter themselves readily appreciate the changed conditions. For generations, unless members of some particular congregation, these "unattached Christians" had been accustomed to come to the parish minister for baptisms, marriages, funerals, advice, and help. He represented "their kirk," to which their allegiance might indeed be sadly slender—yet surely better than no allegiance at all. To-day, as those of us who minister in old parishes know full well, such folk still come to us. Vainly we point out to many of them that they no longer reside within our new

parishes, freshly delimited and shrunk in size as they now are since 1929. Sometimes it is difficult to find out, except after much searching, what their new parish is ; and in the earlier years of the Union it was almost equally difficult to persuade its minister that in sending on to him such people, we were simply doing our own duty and expecting him, in turn, to do his.

The trouble was that, in the effort to give every congregation of the reunited Church its own territorial area, the boundaries had to be artificially drawn and were not familiar. In the country, and in small towns, the new parishes were sometimes far too small. Unions of congregations are helping to amend this—but it is a slow process. Another complication was caused by the fact that many west-end United Free congregations had missions working in poor districts of the same city, often far distant, and now, of course, in another parish altogether. It has not been easy always to reconcile various interests in such cases.

Another feature of modern life militating against the parochial system has been the growth of new housing areas, and the reluctance of many who live in them, when Church members, to sever the connection with their former congregations. Dr George Macleod (13) has vividly and diagrammatically depicted the virtual breakdown of parish discipline under such conditions. National Church Extension is increasingly helping to solve the problem ; but until there can be some specific "direction" of people to their own parish church, and until there is any real hope of such direction being cheerfully and loyally obeyed in the interests of the whole

Church, the whole Christian brotherhood, we must continue to witness the serio-comic spectacle of the Reverend A. wasting an afternoon visiting one of his families six miles distant in the parish of B., while at that precise moment the minister of B. is doing exactly the same thing in Mr A.'s own parish. What a squandering of misdirected energy—while, all the time, the parishioners of both these men must needs remain largely untended!

Obviously there has to be a bold, realistic re-thinking of this whole question. The Commission on the Interpretation of God's Will, appointed by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland shortly after the outbreak of the second World War, undertook an intensive study of the parochial system. On its recommendation the Assembly of 1943 nominated a special committee to initiate a survey of the whole country in consultation with Presbyteries. In its report, presented in 1945, this committee enunciated seven leading principles, which may be briefly stated as follows:—

1. Territorial responsibility a cardinal principle of the Church of Scotland.
2. Parochial visitation a prime duty of the Church in the midst.
3. Presbyteries to take steps to maintain a vital parochial ministry.
4. The name "parish" to be restored, in place of "delimited area."
5. The proper working of the parish in populous district entails increased staffs of trained workers.
6. Grouping of parishes possibly the ultimate

... resolution, in large towns, and industrial areas generally.

7. Members of congregations make too great a demand upon the minister's time, to the exclusion of parochial visitation.

It may be added that the General Assembly approved all these resolutions and sent them down to Presbyteries for their careful consideration.

V.

This lengthy digression upon the parish may seem somewhat irrelevant to the subject of our lectures, "The Chaplain in the Church of Scotland." Not so. For the real dilemma facing us to-day is that, on the one hand, we have this widespread revival of a desire for Christian community, the gathering of all the people in one particular area into a single Household of God, where the comradeship of home and workshop, office and social activity, may be carried into the Church at the centre of it all.

On the other hand, there is a parallel and growing development which at first sight may seem fated, like all parallels, never to meet its opposite neighbour. By this is meant the "Chaplain" type of ministry, specialised service to some particular group of people, at their daily work, as apart from the normal parish and congregation.

The ministers settled in their parishes, with a thousand-year history of successful achievement and prestige behind them, must always remain the great majority and the backbone of our Church.

But equally we cannot do without those on whom has fallen the mantle of St Martin. We might, in modern military parlance, call them the "Recce troops" of our Christian army, the reconnoitring scouts who go ahead of the main body, intent on new methods, new adventures. Like their Celtic forefathers, they regard their task (in words we have already quoted) not merely as "a matter of the map," but as "a matter of spiritual affinity with some particular community."

The possibilities of a clash between the two systems are obvious, unless we make them come to terms with one another. The "some extraordinary officers" whom *The Form of Church-Government* confidently declared to be "ceased" are very much alive again to-day. A new kind of clan ministry has come into its own.

The dangers of isolationism are real enough. I well remember a luncheon conversation in 1941, when I was Deputy Assistant Chaplain-General of an Army Corps in the north of England, with the late Dr Temple, then Archbishop of York. He expressed his hope that, where their numbers were not too great, troops might worship along with the civilian congregations at their usual hour of morning service. The Archbishop went on to say that he felt there was a risk of these men coming to think of segregated church parades as just another bit of army routine, having no particular connection with the civilian life to which one day they must return. He instanced, as a parallel case, that "chapel," in Public Schools, was too often thought of in this same way.

When I heard Dr Temple express this view, I

remembered my sixteen years' ministry in an Edinburgh church attended every Sunday morning by the boys of a famous Scottish Public School. I believe it was good for them, as it was certainly good for the congregation, and have reason to believe that the boys appreciated this weekly break in their intramural activities, linking them up, as it did, with the wider Christian fellowship. Now, I understand, this particular school has abandoned a tradition dating from its foundation, and worships morning as well as evening in its own chapel. The new system may be better from the point of view of educational discipline, but I cannot help feeling that something has been lost in the process.

On the other hand, we recognise that the Chaplain-ministry has come to stay; and the Church must realise and reckon with the fact. If I may quote again from my own army experience, it happened that at the outbreak of the recent war I was at Scottish Command Headquarters, where I had some share in the appointment of Officiating Chaplains to the Forces—civilian ministers who looked after the spiritual welfare of troops in their district for whom no Army Chaplain was at the time available.

Normally, in these instances, one chose the minister of the parish concerned. But this was not always found possible or advisable. Sometimes, while doubtless possessing most admirable qualities, he did not seem, to those of us responsible, the most suitable person for a by no means easy task. In such cases we would appoint some other minister sufficiently near at hand. If this action were questioned, I used to claim with assumed confidence that military establishments were *extra parochiam*. I

fear there was no Church law to justify the statement—but it went unchallenged! A similar example is afforded by University Chapels, which also tacitly assume extra-parochiality, though likewise without strictly legal warrant, so far as I am aware.

The Church must face up to this situation. In days of old a parish minister would, as of right and duty, claim spiritual oversight of any hospital or school which happened to be situated within his bounds. The day is soon coming, if indeed it has not already arrived, when the Church may have to define his duties and responsibilities as confined to those who actually live in families within his own particular area. It may say that he is called upon to undertake specialised Chaplaincy work in school or hospital or factory, only if duly appointed to such by ecclesiastical authority.

This would not lessen but rather increase the responsibility of the Chaplain concerned for endeavouring to work in closest co-operation with the parochial clergy. He must firmly resist any temptation to form a separate congregation. It is rather his task to link up those whom he serves with the church of their home parish, so that the universal fellowship of all God's family may not be artificially narrowed and sectionalised, but rather widened to embrace His children everywhere.

I am only too painfully aware that such a counsel may sound vague and unconvincing. But I cannot see any other, any quick or facile solution. The more clearly the task of every minister is defined, the less danger there will be of overlapping or mutual neglect.

Before ending this introductory lecture, let me

try to indicate the principle underlying those which follow.

I shall make no attempt to deal with foreign missionaries. That would open up far too vast a field. In any case, our churches to-day, in India and Africa and China, tend more and more to approximate to the "parish type," as native Christian communities become more settled and numerous. Many of our missionaries, of course, minister to the British "colonies" around them, as part of their duties; but this will be dealt with in a later lecture on "The Colonial Chaplain."

Nor will any time be taken up in discussing the multitude of minor chaplaincies which most ministers are called upon, at some time or another, to undertake. Youth organisations like the Boys' Brigade, Scouts, Girls' Guildry and Guides, as well as the various pre-service organisations—Sea Cadets, Army Cadets, Air Training Corps, Girls' Training Corps—Masonic Lodges and Friendly Societies, clubs and associations of all kinds appoint their own Chaplains, often as a token of religious respect, an official recognition of the Christian Church. The holders of these offices are not usually overburdened thereby. The duties entailed may in certain cases involve little more than a yearly church parade, occasional presence at a social function or a meeting.

In succeeding lectures I shall deal with the Royal, Military, Colonial, Continental, Educational, and Institutional Chaplain, endeavouring in each case to trace the earlier history of the office, and also treat its modern developments. With one single exception (the Royal Chaplain), the kind of ministry

these represent is either full-time or else involves some considerable expenditure of the holder's energies. He is appointed with the Church's authority and approval, as part of its life and work. I believe that upon that life and work he is destined increasingly to exercise a great and decisive influence (14).

NOTES ON LECTURE I.

(1) *Lives of the Fathers*, vol. i. p. 630.

(2) *The Rise and Relations of the Church of Scotland*, by the Rev. Archibald B. Scott, D.D., pp. 126-166 and 176-184.

(3) It seems still necessary to reiterate that Ninian, not Columba, was the "founding father" of *Ecclesia Scotticana*.

Dr Douglas Simpson writes: "Long before Columba's time Christianity was already widely spread among the Picts, who had their organised Church, between which and Columba there was either active hostility or, at best, complete absence of co-operation."

The following letter from Mr John A. Stewart, Clynder, appeared in *The Glasgow Herald* of 15th February 1946:—

"In your report of a lecture delivered to the St Andrew Society last Saturday it is stated that 'Christianity came to us from Ireland.' Probably the lecturer did not put his view quite so bluntly as reported, but his remark does seem to be an echo of the old delusion that it was Columba who brought the blessings of Christianity to the heathen Scots.

"More than a century before Columba came to Iona there were St Ninian and other missionaries, who converted the greater part of Alba, or Pictland, from Solway to Shetland. Sixty years ago a great authority, the late Dr Alexander MacBain, said that Columba 'swallowed up in his fame all the work of his predecessors, companions and contemporaries, and deprived generations of pioneers and missionaries of their just fame.'

"Give Columba his due: he was a great man and a great politician. Royal on both sides of the house, he might have been a king in Eire; but he preferred to be a king-maker among the Dalriadic Scots of Kintyre. In modern parlance Columba was an Irish political priest on the run after some bloody work at Cooldrevny, and he was advised to retire to Iona, where he could combine penance with active support of his Dalriadic friends. Warfare rather than peace marked Columba's career.

"Columba did not bring Christianity to Scotland: it was Scotland that brought Christianity to the young Columba. St Finbar, founder of the Irish monastery at Moville and tutor of St Columba, was an evangelist trained at St Ninian's Candida Casa (Whithorn), a favourite starting-point for missionaries to Ireland. And Glasgow's own St Mungo was not an exile from Erin."

(4) *Op. cit.*, pp. 142-144.

(5) This question is fully discussed in the Baird Lecture for 1903, *The Doctrine and Validity of the Ministry and Sacraments of the National Church of Scotland*, by the Very Rev. Donald Macleod, D.D. (pp. 72-197). Later studies on the same subject are *A Manual of Church Doctrine*, by the Rev. H. J. Wotherspoon, D.D., and the Rev. J. M. Kirkpatrick, D.D. (pp. 140-186); and *The Presbyterian Tradition*, by the Very Rev. Charles L. Warr, C.V.O., D.D., LL.D. (pp. 54 *et seq.*).

(6) The Roman Catholic Church also recognises a class of beneficed Chaplains supported out of "pious foundations" for the specific duty of saying or arranging for certain masses, or taking part in certain services. These are called *Ecclesiastical*, if the foundation has been

officially recognised as a benefice; *Lay*, if such recognition has not been obtained; *Mercenary*, if the person is a layman; *Collative*, if authorised by a bishop.

Other classes are: (1) *Parochial* or *Auxiliary*, appointed by a priest, under a provision of the Council of Trent, or by a bishop, to take over certain specific duties which he is unable to perform. In the former case the chaplain may be discharged at the priest's pleasure, though the bishop's approbation is necessary for his appointment (a modern Presbyterian parallel would be the ordained assistant in some larger parishes); (2) *Chaplains of convents*; (3) *Pontifical Chaplains*. These are divided into three groups—*capellani honorarii*, a mere title, as the name implies; *capellani ceremonarii*, who assist the Pope in officiating at religious ceremonies; *capellani secreti*, who act as his private secretaries.

(See articles on CHAPLAIN in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, and by Dr Otto Mejer in the *Schaff-Herzog Encyclopædia of Religious Knowledge*.)

(7) Vol. i. pp. 74-84.

(8) I have been much indebted, for this section of my lecture, to *The English Parish and Diocese*, by the Rev. J. V. Bullard, as well as to personal discussions with its author.

(9) *Into all the World: A Statement on Evangelism*, p. 64.

(10) *We Shall Rebuild: The Work of the Iona Community on Mainland and on Island*, by the Rev. George F. Macleod, M.C., D.D.

(11) *Practice and Procedure of the Church of Scotland*, p. 51.

(12) The Presbytery of Edinburgh, in its consideration of the report of the Committee on the Survey of the Parochial System (1945), gave this finding: "It would be helpful if every Parish Church would designate itself as such. The present practice of some churches calling themselves Parish Churches, and others not, tends to

confuse the minds of the people and create needless distinctions."

(13) *Op. cit.*, pp. 99-104.

(14) *Into all the World*, p. 32: "We feel that the most hopeful approach (here) is to the smaller social groups into which communities are naturally divided. . . . We believe that this approach to men and women in the natural groupings of their common life is a method of evangelism which promises good results."

Also at p. 53: "The appointment of ministers as Chaplains to public works, to hospitals and schools, and pre-service training units is a recognition by the Church of an effective method of approach to people where they are. In such contacts with secular life there is an opportunity of getting into close touch with men and women and youth who are out of reach of the normal activities of organised religion. There is a unique opportunity of bridging the gulf which separates so many from the Church, by showing understanding of the problems and difficulties of the common life. A Church alive to its evangelistic obligations will be on the watch for opportunities of creating such chaplaincies, possibly in certain cases making full-time appointments.

"The days when the work of the individual minister in his own parish was an adequate means of evangelistic endeavour are long gone. Valuable opportunities for evangelism are to be found not only in the visitation of people in their homes, but in going where they are, in school and hospital, shipyard and factory. It has become increasingly clear that to meet modern conditions there is required much greater flexibility than at present exists in the Church's use of its ordained ministry. Presbyterianism in general has not developed the variety of offices which exist under some other forms of Church government. Wisely used, these afford opportunities for setting apart ministers of special gifts and experience in evangelism or other enterprises other than the traditional parochial ministry. Presbyterian prin-

ciples themselves are not in any way opposed to varied types of ministry or to the co-operation of several ministers in one important sphere. Practical questions of the training of students, of status and finance, and the absence of any method of dealing with them, present the most serious obstacles. The need for specialised forms of ministry, however, especially for the evangelisation of the industrial areas of our country, is so evident that no reluctance to alter existing regulations or to modify even time-honoured methods of organisation should be allowed to hamper developments which are already long overdue."